



# राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

## हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

शुक्रवार, 08 मई, 2015 / 18 वैशाख, 1937

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

*Shimla, the 05<sup>th</sup> May, 2015*

**No. Sharm (A) 6-1/2014 (Awards).**—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of the following cases announced by the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Shimla on the website of the Department of Labour & Employment of the Government of Himachal Pradesh:—

Sl. No.	Case No. August, 2013	Title of the Case	Date of Award
1.	22/2012	Shri Pardeep Kumar V/s XEN, HPSEB Shimla.	12-02-2015
2.	96/2010	Shri Hari Ram V/s HPSEB, Shimla.	11-03-2015
3.	20/2012	Shri Hari Singh V/s HPSEB Chopal.	11-03-2015
4.	13/2014	Shri Rakesh Kumar V/S Dagshai Public School, Solan.	10-03-2015
5.	14/2014	Shri Manju Bala V/S -do-	10-03-2015

By order,  
Sd/-  
*Pr. Secretary (Labour & Employment).*

**IN THE COURT OF A.S JASWAL, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Ref no. 22 of 2012.

Instituted on 31.5.2012.

Decided on. 12.2.2015.

Pradeep Kumar S/o Shri Paras Ram R/o Pragti Kuteer, Shanan New Bhalai, P.O Sanjauli Shimla (HP). *. Petitioner.*

*V/S.*

The Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B. Electrical Division, Shimla, District Shimla, H.P. *. Respondent.*

**Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.**

For petitioner: Shri Rahul Kashyap, Advocate.

For respondent: Shri Ramakant Sharma, Advocate.

*AWARD*

The reference, for adjudication, is as under:

**“Whether termination of the services of Shri Pradeep Kumar S/o Shri Paras Ram R/o Pragati Kuteer Shanan, new Bhalai, P.O Sanjauli Shimla (HP) by the Executive Engineer, HPSEB Electricla Division Shimla District Shimla w.e.f. 26.2.1994 without following the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified? If**

**not, to what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above workman is entitled to from the above employer?"**

2. In nutshell, the case of the petitioner is that he was initially engaged as daily waged beldar, on 26.2.1988, by the respondent and worked as such till 25.5.1988. Again, he was reengaged on 5.1.1990 and continued till 18.11.1991, when his services were dispensed with without following the provisions of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as Act). It is further averred that on 7.6.1994, he had been given assurance by the concerned XEN that he would be reengaged as and when the work was to be available. However, the needful was not done. With the hope that he (petitioner) would be reengaged, he had kept on visiting the office of the respondent board but of no avail. Ultimately, he raised a demand notice on 29.6.2004 but the same met with rejection on 28.12.2006. Thus, he made a representation to the Hon'ble Chief Minister and in pursuance to the directions, made in this regard, by the Hon'ble Chief Minister, the respondent board processed his case. Despite that, the respondent board dilly-dallied in the matter of his reengagement. Ultimately, on 24.5.2010, he applied under RTI Act and got obtained the required information which was supplied to him on 1.7.2010. In the information, so supplied, the respondent board had admitted its mistake to disengage him. It is alleged that the petitioner had completed 240 days in a calendar year. Thus, his termination was against the mandatory provisions of the Act specifically sections 25-F, 25-G and 25-H. It is further maintained that he is not gainfully employed. Against this back-drop a prayer has been made for his reengagement, with all the consequential service benefits, including back wages.

3. The claim of the petitioner has been contested on having raised various preliminary objections including maintainability and that the petitioner is estopped from filing this petition due to his own acts, conduct etc. On merits, it has been asserted that the petitioner, who had been engaged, as daily waged beldar, on 25.1.1988, had continued to work as such with breaks till 25.5.1988, when he abandoned the job on his own sweet will. He had not completed 240 days in any calendar year. Thereafter, he was reengaged w.e.f. 26.4.1990 and continued as such till 25.11.1991 when he again abandoned his job. Thereafter, he was reengaged on 10.2.1994 and continued till 25.3.1994 when he again left his job. The demand notice which had been raised by the petitioner was rightly rejected by the appropriate government. It is admitted that he had been supplied information on 1.7.2010. Since, the petitioner had abandoned his job, on his own, there is no question that his services had been terminated in violation of the provisions of sections 25-F, 25 G and 25-H of the Act. Other allegations denied.

4. By filing rejoinder, the petitioner has reaffirmed his own allegations by denying those of the respondent.

5. Pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues which were struck on 16.3.2013.

1. Whether the termination of service of petitioner by the respondent with effect from 26.2.1994 is in violation of the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947? . . .*OPP.*
2. If issue no. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief the petitioner is entitled to? . . .*OPR.*
3. Whether this petition is not maintainable as alleged? . . .*OPR.*
4. Whether the petitioner has abandoned the job at his own? . . .*OPR.*
5. Relief.

6. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

7. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing issues for determination, my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under.

Issue no.1      Accordingly in yes.

Issue no.2      Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity but without back wages.

Issue no.3      No.

Issue no.4      No.

Relief.            Reference answered in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent, per operative part of award.

### *Reasons for findings*

#### *Issue no.1 & 4.*

8. Being interlinked, both these issues are taken up together for discussion and decision.

9. The contention of the petitioner is that his services w.e.f. 26.2.1994, had been terminated without following the mandatory provisions of the Act. On the other hand, the defence version is that, on his own, he had abandoned the job.

10. In his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, the petitioner (PW-1) has supported all the facts as stated in the petition on all material counts including that on 18.11.1991, his services had been dispensed with without notice and paying compensation. He also stated that on 7.6.1994, the concerned XEN had assured to reengage him subject to the availability of work but of no avail. On 29.6.2004, he had raised a demand notice which was rejected by the appropriate government on 28.12.2006. He had got obtained an information under the RTI Act, by moving an application, Ex. PW-1/B and that the same is Ex. PA. He also stated that he is not gainfully employed anywhere. In the cross-examination, he denied that for a specific work, he had been engaged and that he did not complete 240 days in a calendar year. He also denied that, on his own, he had left the job

11. Shri Pratap Singh (RW-1), has stated that the petitioner, on his own, had left the job on 25.5.1988. He also remained absent from 26.1.1988 to 25.2.1988. From 26.4.1990 to 25.11.1991, he was again reengaged. Ex. R-1 and Ex. R-2, are his mandays chart. In the cross-examination, he admitted that during 1990 and 1991, the petitioner had completed 240 days. He expressed his ignorance that the persons, named in mark B, who are junior to the petitioner, were reengaged or not.

12. From Ex. R-1, mandays chart, it is abundantly clear that w.e.f. 26.4.1990 to 28.3.1991, the petitioner had worked for 316 days. In his affidavit Ex. PW- 1/A, the petitioner has also stated that on 18.11.1991, his services had been dispensed with. Although, the reference, which has been made to this Court pertains to the alleged termination of the services of the petitioner w.e.f. 26.2.1994, without following the provisions of the Act, but there is no such record produced by the respondent that in fact, the petitioner had worked till 26.2.1994, when his services were allegedly dispensed with. I may mention that even, from Ex. R-2, the mandays chart, it is abundantly clear

that the petitioner had worked till 25.4.1991. Since, in the preceding twelve calendar months he (petitioner) had completed more than 240 days as is evident from Ex. R-2, it was incumbent upon the respondent to have complied with the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. For the failure of the respondent to have complied with the provisions of the said Act, I have no hesitation to hold that his termination w.e.f. 25.4.1991, is against the provisions of the Act. Although, the defence version is to this effect that the petitioner had abandoned the job, on his own, but in the statement of Shri Pradeep Kumar (RW-1), it has nowhere come that the petitioner, who had allegedly left the job, had been sent any notice/communication to resume the work. It has been held by our own Hon'ble High Court in *latest HLJ 2007 (HP) 903 State of HP & Others Vs. Bhatag Ram & Another*. that:—

*“Plea of abandonment of job- merely raising the plea of abandonment is nothing but has to be established on the basis of facts. No facts led to substantiate the plea.”*

13. For my above discussion and law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court (supra), I have no hesitation in holding that the services of the petitioner had been terminated/disengaged, illegally and in an unjustified manner and that too without complying with the provisions of the Act. Accordingly, my answer to issue no.1 is in “yes” and issue no.4 is in “no”.

#### *Issue no.2*

14. The petitioner has claimed his reinstatement with all the consequential service benefits. On the other hand, Ld. Counsel for the respondent has urged with vehemence that having regard to the short period for which the petitioner had remained engaged, he should be awarded compensation and not reinstatement. In support of his such contention, he has relied upon (2013) 5 SCC 136, Assistant Engineer, Rajasthan Development Corporation and another Vs. Gitam Singh. However, I am of the view that the manner in which the services of the petitioner had stood disengaged, he deserves to be reinstated. The services of the petitioner had been terminated on 25.4.1991 but he had raised the demand notice after about 13 years i.e on 29.6.2004. Keeping all the facts, in mind, it would be in the interest of justice if he is ordered to be reinstated when he had raised the demand notice i.e w.e.f. 29.6.2004. Accordingly, I order so. As far as grant of back wages to the petitioner are concerned, I may mention that *the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2010 (1) SLJ S.C 70, M/s Ritu Marbals Vs. Prabhakant Shukla* has ruled that “full back wages cannot be granted mechanically, upon a order of termination be declared illegal. It is further held that reinstatement must not be accompanied by payment of full back wages even for the period when the workman remained out of service and contributed little or nothing to the Industry”.

16. Consequently, for what has been stated and observed above, the petitioner is held entitled to be reinstated in service with seniority and continuity but without back wages from the date when he raised demand notice i.e w.e.f. 29.6.2004. Thus, my answer to this issue is in “Yes”.

#### *Issue no.3*

16. When, the reference came to be made to this Court, the petitioner filed the statement of claim. Thus, it cannot be said that this petition is not maintainable. Thus, by holding it to be maintainable, my answer to this issue is in “no”.

#### *Relief.*

As a sequel to my discussion/findings on the aforesaid issues, the claim of the petitioner is partly allowed and as such the respondent is directed to reinstate him with seniority and continuity but without back wages from the date when he raised demand notice i.e w.e.f. 29.6.2004. Let a

copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in official gazette. File, after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open court today this day of 12th Feb., 2015.

(A.S JASWAL),  
Presiding Judge,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

**IN THE COURT OF A.S JASWAL, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM- LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Ref no. 96 of 2010.

Instituted on 7.8.2010

Decided on. 11.3.2015.

Hari Ram S/o Shri Jathu Ram R/o Vilage Mehri Kathala, P.O Nalti, Tehsil Ghumarwin,  
District Bilsapur, HP. . *Petitioner.*

*VS.*

1. The Secy. HPSEB, Vidyut Bhawan, Shimla-4.
2. The Director, SJVNL (NJPC), BCS New, Shimla, HP. . *Respondents.*

**Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.**

For petitioner: Shri R.K Khidta, Advocate.

For respondent No.1: Shri Ramakant Sharma, Advocate.

For respondent No.2: Shri S.D Sharma, Advocate.

**AWARD**

The reference, for adjudication, is as under:

**“Whether termination of the services of Shri Hari Ram S/o Shri Jathu Ram by the above employers w.e.f. 30.4.1991 (F.N) without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and clause 14 of the Certified Standing Orders of the HPSEB, is legal and justified? If not, to what relief of service benefits including reinstatement, arrear of back wages and compensation the above named workman is entitled to from the above employers?”**

2. In nutshell, the case of the petitioner is that he was engaged as driver by the respondent in the office of Assistant Engineer, Nathpa Jhakri (E) P&M , Sub Division Dhalli, Shimla-12 w.e.f. 1.5.1989 and worked as such till 30.4.1991, continuously. In fact, on 20.4.1991, said Assistant Engineer had served him notice whereby his services stood terminated/retrrenched w.e.f. 30.4.1991. Immediately, after having been served with said notice, dated 20.4.1991, he filed OA no. 537/1991,

before the Hon'ble Administrative Tribunal (hereinafter referred as Tribunal), on 29.4.1991, and the same was allowed vide order dated 2.6.2000. Since, respondent no.1, had felt aggrieved by the said judgment, a writ petition was filed before the Hon'ble High Court, registered as CWP No. 805/2000, in which the judgment of the Tribunal was set aside, as per judgment passed on 17.12.2004, mainly on the ground that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain the matter. However, the Hon'ble High Court had given liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate authority under the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as Act). It is further averred that after the passing of judgment of the Hon'ble High Court, the petitioner filed demand notice before the Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Shimla but the conciliation proceedings failed and thus a reference was caused to be made to this Court. In the order/judgment dated 2.6.2000, passed by the Tribunal, the termination of the petitioner had been set aside on the ground that the mandatory provisions of the Act as well as clause 14 of the HPSEB Standing Orders were violated. It is further averred that the petitioner had completed 240 days in each calendar year to the satisfaction of the respondents. After his illegal termination, he had continued to visit the office of the Assistant Engineer, number of times but of no avail. It is further averred that the respondents have also engaged new persons without calling the petitioner. Since, the services of the petitioner had been terminated in violation of the provisions of section 25-F, 25-G, 25-H and 25-N of the Act as well as Standing Orders of the HPSEB, he deserves to be reinstated with all the consequential service benefits including full back wages and regularization.

3. The claim of the petitioner has been contested by respondent no.1 on having raised various preliminary objections including maintainability, limitation and that it is bad for non joinder and mis-joinder of necessary parties because w.e.f. 1.8.1991, all assets, works, liabilities as well as staff working for Nathpa Jhakri Project stood transferred and vested in NJPC (now known as SJVN) which being an independent legal entity is a necessary party. On merits, it has been sated that at the relevant time, NJPC known as SJVNL was part and parcel of HPSEB but now since 1.8.1991, it is an independent body and working as joint venture under State and Central governments. The petitioner had been engaged as daily waged driver purely on temporary basis till the appointment of regular driver, who joined his post on 30.4.1991. It is further pleaded that the services of the petitioner had been terminated after serving due notice and offering payment in lieu of notice for retrenchment, wages for such period as the notice fell short of one month, along-with the retrenchment compensation, in terms of the provisions of the Act but he failed to accept the same. It is further reiterated that in view of the posting of the new incumbent, the services of the petitioner were no longer required. As far as the provisions of Standing Orders are concerned, those are not applicable in the organization of the replying respondent. Annexure RA-6, is the copy of order dated 31.7.1991, transferring all the assets and liabilities to the NJPC. Since, the disengagement of the petitioner w.e.f. 30.4.1991, had been made by the competent authority, in accordance with law, therefore, such action is perfectly legal and warrants no interference. Other allegations either admitted or denied.

4. Respondent no.2, also contested the claim of the petitioner by raising preliminary objection qua maintainability. On merits, it has been stated that well before 1.8.1991, when the SJVN (respondent no.2) came into being, as an independent entity, the services of the petitioner had already stood terminated by respondent no.1. It is further averred that HPSEB rules and regulations continue to govern the service conditions of those employees who had been transferred to SJVN Ltd. Since, the replying respondent had not in any way involved in the engagement or retrenchment of the services of the petitioner, no relief can be claimed against it. Other allegations denied.

5. By filing rejoinders, the petitioner has reaffirmed his own allegations by denying those of the respondents.

6. Pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues which were struck on 2.4.2011.

1. Whether the services of the workman Hari Ram have been terminated in an illegal manner without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and standing orders of the respondent Board as alleged? . . .*OPP*.
2. If issue no. 1 is proved in affirmative, whether petitioner workman is entitled for reinstatement, back wages and other statutory benefits as prayed? . . .*OPP*.
3. Whether this claim petition is not maintainable? . . .*OPR*.
4. Relief.

7. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing issues for determination, my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under.

Issue no.1      Accordingly in yes.

Issue no.2      Entitled to reinstatement with seniority and continuity but without back wages.

Issue no.3.      Yes against respondent no.2.

Relief.            Reference answered in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent No.1, per operative part of award.

#### *Reasons for findings*

##### *Issue no.1 & 2.*

9. Being interlinked and interconnected, both these issues are taken up together for discussion and decision.

10. It has been specifically stated by the petitioner that consequent upon notice, dated 20.4.1991, his services had stood terminated w.e.f. 30.4.1991 in violation of the provisions of the Act. The plea of respondent no.1 is that on having complied with the provisions of the Act, the services of the petitioner had been legally terminated. Since, a regular incumbent/driver had joined his duties w.e.f. 1.5.1991, the petitioner is not entitled for any relief. The stand taken by respondent no.2 is that on 1.8.1991, when it came into being, as an independent entity, neither the services of the petitioner had been transferred to it nor it, in any manner, had played role as far as his termination w.e.f. 30.4.1991 was concerned.

11. The petitioner (PW-1) in his affidavit has reaffirmed the allegations as made in the petition on all material counts including that he had completed 240 days in each calendar year before his services were terminated in violation of the provisions of the Act. He categorically stated that the notice which had been issued to him, was not proper. Without calling him back to join service, the respondents have engaged new persons. In the cross-examination, he stated that w.e.f. 1.8.1991, NJPC (project) is known as SJVN. As far as HPSEB and NJPC are concerned, those are

separate entities. He denied that on 1.5.1991, he had been issued notice of termination of services with wages of one month vide mark X and that he refused to receive the same. He denied that on 30.4.1991, Shri Harish Chander, joined as regular driver. He admitted that after bifurcation, there was no liability of HPSEB. When cross-examined on behalf of respondent no.2, he admitted that when he was appointed, Nathpa Jhakri Project was being executed by HPSEB. He further admitted that he had been appointed by the Board and his services had been terminated by it (Board).

12. Shri Deepak Chauhan (PW-2), stated that he could not bring the summoned record pertaining to Hari Ram (petitioner) because the same is not available with the Board for the reason that it already stood transferred/sent to NJPC on 1.8.1991. In OA No. 537/1991, in which Electricity Board was a party, its stand was that the petitioner was its worker. The petitioner had worked continuously from 1.5.1989 to 30.4.1991. On being cross-examined on behalf of respondent no.1, he admitted that HPSEB, after 1.8.1991, had no control of the workers who were employees of NJPC. When, cross-examined on behalf of respondent no.2, he admitted that SJVN came into existence on 1.8.1991 and that the petitioner had been engaged by the Board which terminated his services. He further admitted that the employees/workers who had come on the rolls, of SJVNL, from the Board, on secondment basis, their list had been prepared. In that list, the name of the petitioner did not figure.

13. Shri Jagat Ram (RW-1) has stated that on 1.5.1989, the petitioner was engaged as driver on daily wages basis and that he worked, till 30.4.1991, continuously. In order to retrench the services of the petitioner, he had been issued notice dated 20.4.1991, which is mark A. The petitioner had been paid retrenchment compensation. HPSEB and SJVNL are separate entities. In the cross-examination, he admitted that NJPC (project) and its offices were being run by HPSEB till 31.7.1991. The petitioner who had been engaged by HPSEB in Nathpa Jhakri Project, was disengaged by HPSEB on 30.4.1991. Only that staff had been transferred from NJPC to SJVNL which had been in service on 31.7.1991. On having been cross-examined, on behalf of respondent no.1, he stated that he has brought no such record on the basis of which it could be said that the petitioner had completed 240 days. The services of the petitioner had been terminated on the basis of the notice dated 20.4.1991, the copy of which is Ex. RX. The Board has its standing orders. He admitted that on 20.4.1991, the provisions of the Act were applicable to Electricity Board. He admitted that if a worker had to be terminated, he was required to be given one month's notice. The petitioner had not been issued one month's notice. He also admitted that along-with notice dated 20.4.1991, no compensation had been paid/sent to the petitioner. He further admitted that the work which the petitioner was performing is still available with the Board, NJPC and SJVNL.

14. Shri Surender Sharma (RW-2) who has appeared as a witness, on behalf of respondent no.2, has stated that SJVNL started running the Project, which was being earlier run by NJPC, w.e.f. 1.8.1991 vide notification, Ex. RW-1/C. The employees who had been working with NJPC till 31.7.1991 were transferred to SJVNL. The services of the petitioner had never been transferred to SJVNL for the reason that the same stood already retrenched by the HPSEB on 30.4.1991. In the cross-examination, he admitted that even today, the work of driver is available in SJVNL.

15. From the evidence, which has been referred to above, it is abundantly clear that the provisions of the Act were applicable to HPSEB on 20.4.1991, when a notice for the termination of the petitioner was issued. It has been admitted by Shri Jagat Ram (RW-1) that one month's notice was required to be issued to the petitioner for terminating his services. It has been stated by the petitioner that he had completed 240 days in each calendar year before his termination. PW-2, Shri Deepak Chauhan has stated that the petitioner had continuously worked from 1.5.1989 to 30.4.1991. Since, from the evidence, on record, it stands proved that before his termination, the petitioner had completed 240 days, respondent no.1 (HPSEB) was required to have complied with the provisions of section 25-F of the Act before terminating his services w.e.f. 30.4.1991. Since, the

mandatory provisions of the Act had not been complied by respondent no.1 before terminating the services of the petitioner, I hold his termination w.e.f. 30.4.1991 to be illegal and unjustified.

16. Now, the question arises as to what service benefits the petitioner is entitled to. I may mention that from the record, it is clearly borne out that the services of the petitioner had come to be retrenched /terminated w.e.f. 30.4.1991. Although, a plea has been taken by respondent no.1, that, when SJVNL came into being, as a separate entity, the services of the employees of HPSEB/NJPC, stood transferred to it. Since, the services of the petitioner had already stood terminated w.e.f. 30.4.1991, he was not transferred to SJVNL. It has been specifically stated by PW-2 (Deepak Chauhan) that the employees/workers who had been transferred to SJVNL, their list had been prepared and in that list the name of the petitioner did not figure. When, the services of the petitioner had not been terminated by respondent no.2, it cannot be directed to reinstate him. As, the services of the petitioner had been illegally terminated by respondent no.1 (HPSEB) w.e.f. 30.4.1991, it is duty bound to reinstate him w.e.f. 1.5.1991. As far as grant of back wages to the petitioner are concerned, I may mention that *the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2010 (1) SLJ S.C 70, M/s Ritu Marbals Vs. Prabhakant Shukla* has ruled that “full back wages cannot be granted mechanically, upon a order of termination be declared illegal. It is further held that reinstatement must not be accompanied by payment of full back wages even for the period when the workman remained out of service and contributed little or nothing to the Industry”.

17. The petitioner has also claimed regularization in service. His such claim cannot be looked into by this Court because as far as his regularization is concerned, it is to be ordered by the department concerned as per the Policy of the State Government regarding regularization of daily wagers.

18. Consequently, for what has been stated and observed above, the petitioner is held entitled to be reinstated in service with seniority and continuity but without back wages w.e.f. 1.5.1991. Thus, both these issues are answered accordingly.

### *Issue no.3*

19. An objection has been taken by the respondents that this petition is not legally maintainable. I may mention that as far as the maintainability of this petition against respondent no.2, is concerned, it cannot be said to be legally maintainable against it because at the relevant time neither the petitioner had been engaged by it, on 1.5.1989, nor his services were terminated by it w.e.f. 30.4.1991 consequent upon the notice dated 20.4.1991. Thus, I hold that although this petition is legally maintainable against respondent no.1, it is not maintainable against respondent no.2. Thus, this issue is answered accordingly.

### *Relief.*

As a sequel to my discussion/findings on the aforesaid issues, the claim of the petitioner is partly allowed and as such respondent no.1 (HPSEB) is directed to reinstate him with seniority and continuity but without back wages w.e.f. 1.5.1991. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in official gazette. File, after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open court today this day of 11th March, 2015.

(A.S JASWAL),  
Presiding Judge,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

**IN THE COURT OF A.S JASWAL, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM- LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA.**

Ref no. 20 of 2012.

Instituted on 31.5.2012

Decided on. 11.3.2015.

Hari Singh S/o Sh. Kumbia Ram R/O Village Thundara, P.O. Malot, Tehsil Chopal, Distt. Shimla, H.P. . *Petitioner.*

*VS.*

The Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B. Electrical Division, Chopal, District Shimla, H.P. . *Respondent.*

**Reference under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.**

For petitioner: Shri Sanjeev Sharma, Advocate.

For respondent: Shri Ramakant Sharma, Advocate.

*AWARD*

The reference, for adjudication, is as under:

**“Whether termination of the services of Shri Hari Singh S/O Sh. Kumbia Ram R/O Village Thundara, P.O. Malot, Tehsil Chopal, Distt. Shimla HP by the Executive Engineer, H.P.S.E.B. Electrical Division, Chopal, Distt. Shimla. w.e.f. 25.1.1990 without following the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified ? If not, to what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above workman is entitled to from the above employer?”**

2. In nutshell, the case of the petitioner is that he was employed as daily waged beldar on 26.12.1985 in the Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board, Electric Division, Nerwa under the Electric Division Theog. In the year, 1990, a new division was created namely HPSEB, Chopal and after the creation of new division, his services were transferred to HPSEB Sub Division Nerwa (now Kupvi) under the HPSEB Electric Division, Chopal. To the satisfaction of his superiors, he had been performing his duties honestly and sincerely. It is further averred that he had been working continuously and uninterruptedly except some fictional breaks. However, on 25.1.1990, he was orally told by the concerned Assistant Engineer that his services were no longer required and as such he was not to come for duties w.e.f. 26.1.1990. In this way, his services were terminated without complying with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred as Act) as well as Standing Orders framed and notified by the respondent board. Even, the principles of First come Last go was not followed. It is further averred that at the time of his disengagement, it was told that he would be called back/reengaged as and when work was to be available. Thereafter, he continued to visit the office of SDO concerned with the request to reengage him but of no avail. In the year, 1996, he came to know that many fresh persons namely S/Shri Ram Lal, Lachhi Ram, Dharam Singh and Ratti Ram had been engaged by the competent authority in Sub Division HPSEB Kupvi. Since, he had not been called for reemployment, he visited the office of the respondent with the request to reengage him but the needful was not done. In these circumstances,

he was compelled to approach the Hon'ble High Court by filing Civil Writ Petition which was registered as CWP no. 962/1996 titled as Hari Singh Vs. HPSEB, which was disposed of vide judgment dated 1.8.1996 whereby he (petitioner) was afforded opportunity to file representation within three weeks to his employer who (employer) was to dispose of the same within four weeks. In compliance to the directions issued by the Hon'ble High Court, he submitted a detailed representation to the respondent board in which he submitted his termination to be in utter violation of the provisions of section 25-F, 25-G and 25-H of the Act as well as Standing Orders, framed and notified by the respondent. However, without looking the factual position as well as legal submission, made by the petitioner, his representation was rejected. Thereafter, he served a demand notice on the competent authority and during conciliation proceedings, Executive Engineer, HPSEB Chopal, filed detailed reply wherein it was averred that the services of the petitioner were never terminated but he had left the same on his own. In that reply, the employer had admitted that after his termination, many fresh persons had been engaged without calling the petitioner to join duties. Since, the conciliation proceedings had failed, a report, in this regard, was made to the Labour Commissioner Himachal Pradesh under section 12 of the Act. It is averred that the Labour Commissioner, without having appreciated the facts, declined the making of reference, mainly on the ground of delay, vide letter dated 1.2.2002. On having felt aggrieved, with the action of the Labour Commissioner, he (petitioner) approached the Hon'ble High Court by filing Civil Writ Petition, CWP no. 508 of 2002, which was allowed vide judgment dated 21.5.2007. Against the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Single Judge, dated 21.5.2007, an LPA bearing no. 157 of 2007, was filed which was dismissed vide judgment dated 29.3.2012. In this way, a reference was caused to be made to this Court by the appropriate government. It is averred that since, his services had been terminated in violation of the mandatory provisions of the Act, especially, 25-F, 25-G and 25 H, he deserves to be reengaged/reinstated with all the consequential service benefits including back wages.

3. The claim of the petitioner has been contested on having raised various preliminary objections including maintainability, barred by time and also that the claim raised by the petitioner suffers from laches. On merits, it has been asserted that the petitioner who had been initially engaged as daily waged beldar, on muster roll w.e.f. 26.3.1986 had worked as such up to 25.1.1990 under Electric Sub Division, Kupvi under the administrative control of Electric Division, HPSEB Theog with certain interruptions/breaks. Further, he had never completed 240 days in any calendar year. It is further averred that the services of the petitioner had never been terminated by the replying respondent. In fact, on his own, he had left the job by not turning after 25.1.1990. Since, he had not completed 240 days of continuous service, he had not acquired the status of temporary workman, under the provisions of the Act, to entitle him for the service of notice as well as payment of retrenchment compensation. Although, no fresh hands were engaged but three persons namely S/Shri Ram Lal, Lachhi Ram and Dharam Singh had to be reengaged in pursuance of the orders/directions passed by the Labour Court. It is further averred that from 1990 till 1996, the petitioner never raised any dispute. Other allegations either admitted or denied.

4. Pleadings of the parties gave rise to the following issues which were struck on 5.9.2013.

1. Whether the termination of service of petitioner with effect from 25.1.1990 without following the provisions of Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 is illegal and unjustified as alleged?  
.. *OPP.*
2. If issue no. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what benefits the petitioner is entitled to?  
.. *OPR.*
3. Relief.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the record of the case carefully.

6. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing issues for determination, my findings on the aforesaid issues are as under.

Issue no.1      Accordingly in yes.

Issue no.2      Entitled to reinstatement w.e.f. 1.1.1996 but without back wages.

Relief.            Reference answered in favour of the petitioner and against the respondent, per operative part of award.

### *Reasons for findings*

#### *Issue no.1.*

7. It has been very specifically stated by the petitioner that his services had been terminated/disengaged w.e.f. 25.1.1990, by the respondent, without having complied with the mandatory provisions of the Act. On the other hand, the stand taken by the respondent is to this effect that since the petitioner, on his own, had left the job on 25.1.1990, and that he had not remained in continuous service for 240 days in any of the calendar years, there was no necessity to have complied with the requirements of section 25-F of the Act. The stand of the respondent regarding fresh engagements is that three persons, as named above, had to be reengaged on the orders of this Court.

8. In his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, the petitioner (PW-1) has supported the facts as stated in the petition on all material counts including that on 25.1.1990, his services had been orally terminated by the concerned SDO. He also stated that in the year, 1996, when he came to know that fresh persons had been employed by the competent authority, without having given him preference, he again visited the office of his employer with the request to reengage him but of no avail. The persons, who had been engaged after his disengagement are S/Shri Ram Lal, Lachi Ram, Dharam Singh and Ratti Ram. Since, his services had been terminated in violation of the provisions of the Act, he deserves to be reengaged with all the consequential benefits. Ex. PW-1/B, is the reply to his demand notice. Copy of his mandays chart is Ex. PW-1/C. Ex. PW-1/F, is the copy of CWP No. 508 of 2002. Ex. PW-1/G, is the copy of LPA no. 157 of 2007. In every calendar year, he had completed 240 days. In the cross-examination, he denied that he used to remain absent from duties and that his services were never terminated. After 25.1.1990, he was not called for job.

9. Shri Sita Ram (PW-2) has stated from the summoned record that Ex. PW-2/A, is the copy of the mandays chart of the petitioner as per which, he (petitioner) had been engaged on 26.12.1985, on muster roll. When, his services were terminated, neither any notice was issued nor he was paid compensation. From 26.1.1987 till 25.12.1987, the petitioner had worked for 309 days, which has also been shown in Ex. PW-1/C. Juniors, to the petitioner, namely Lachhi Ram, Dharam Singh and Ratti Ram have been regularized. The status of Shri Ram Lal who is also junior to the petitioner is that of work charge. The department had terminated the services of the petitioner orally. Ex. PW-1/G, is the copy of the judgment of LPA, which has been filed by the department. Ex. PW-2/A has been prepared on the basis of muster roll register. Ex. PW-2/B is the mandays chart upto 1990. In the cross-examination, he stated that as per the summoned record, Hari Singh (petitioner) had been engaged on 26.12.1985 as beldar on muster roll. Ex. PW-1/B and Ex. PW 1/E, have not been prepared by him. He denied that no junior to the petitioner has been in service of the respondent.

10. Shri Vijay Kumar (RW-1) has stated that the petitioner, who had been engaged as daily waged beldar on 26.3.1986, had worked till 25.1.1990. In no calendar year, he had completed 240 days. The department had not terminated the services of the petitioner who, on his own, had left the job on 25.1.1990 and thereafter, did not turn up. Since, the petitioner had himself, left the job, there was no necessity to issue him notice and to pay compensation. The department has not engaged any person junior to the petitioner. Who-so-ever have been engaged, those were engaged on the orders of the Court. In the cross-examination, he admitted that after 25.1.1990, the department had engaged other persons on daily wages. Self-stated that, they had been engaged on the orders of the Court. He admitted that on 25.1.1990, the services of the petitioner had been terminated, orally. He further admitted that at present there is work available with the department in Electric Sub Division Kupvi.

11. From the evidence, which has been referred to above, it is abundantly clear that the petitioner has failed to prove that he had worked for 240 days in a calendar year preceding his alleged termination. It has been specifically stated by Shri Vijay Kumar (RW-1), that in no calendar year, the petitioner had completed 240 days. In my considered view, the petitioner has failed to prove that he has completed 240 days in a calendar year preceding his termination. To claim benefit under section 25-F of the Act, it was upon the petitioner to have established that prior to his termination, he had completed 240 days. It has been held in 2009 (120) FLR 1007 *an Civil Appeal no. 4468 of 2005 of Hon'ble Supreme Court incase titled as Relip Nagarpalika Vs. Babuji Gabhaji Thakore and others* that:

*“The burden of proof lies on the workman to show that he had worked continuously for 240 days for the preceding one year and it is for the workman to adduce evidence apart from examining himself to prove the factum of being in employment of the employer.”*

Since, the petitioner has failed to prove that he had worked continuously for 240 days in the preceding one year from the date of his termination, his alleged termination cannot be said to be in contravention of the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. The evidence further goes to show that after 25.1.1990, when the services of the petitioner were terminated, the department has engaged new persons as named above. If new persons were required to be engaged, the department concerned was required to call the petitioner to join duties in compliance with the mandatory provisions of the Act. On the record, there is no such document, which may go to show that when persons junior to the petitioner were engaged, any notice had been issued to him to join his job. Since, the petitioner has proved, on record, that persons junior to him, as named above, have been engaged by the respondent after his termination, his termination w.e.f. 25.1.1990, deserves to be held as illegal and in violation of the provisions of the Act. It has been held by our own Hon'ble High Court, incase titled as *State of HP & Others V/s Bhatag Ram & Anr. as reported in latest HLJ 2007 (HP) 903*. that :—

*“Continuing of 240 days is not necessary in 12 calendar months. It is not necessary to workman to complete 240 days during 12 months for taking the benefits of section 25-G & 25-H of the Act.”*

12. The defence version is to this effect that the petitioner, on his own, had left the job but in support thereof, there is no evidence at all. I may mention that if the petitioner had left the job, on his own, it was incumbent upon the respondent to have issued him notice to join his duties. No such document has been brought, on record, which may go to show that any such notice had been issued to the petitioner.

13. For my above discussion and law laid down by the Hon'ble High Court (supra), I have no hesitation in holding that the services of the petitioner had been terminated/disengaged, illegally

and in an unjustified manner and that too without complying with the provisions of the Act especially sections 25-G and 25-H. Accordingly, my answer to this issue is in "Yes".

*Issue no.2*

14. The petitioner has claimed his reinstatement with all the consequential service benefits including back wages. The evidence, on record, goes to show that the services of the petitioner were terminated, orally, on 25.1.1990 but he pursued his case seriously in the year, 1996 when he came to know that fresh persons had been given employment by the competent authority. Although, it is his version that he had kept on going/visiting the concerned office for his reengagement but there is no cogent evidence, in this regard, on the record,. In case, he had been visiting the concerned office, he was required to have moved some application for his reengagement. In the absence of such, I am of the view that only in the year, 1996, the petitioner had taken recourse for his reengagement. I may mention that only in the year, 1996, he had filed CWP no. 962 of 1996 titled as Hari Singh Vs. HPSEB in the Hon'ble High Court, in which, it had been ordered that he was to file representation before respondent no.1 which was to be decided within four weeks. Since, the petitioner has failed to prove that w.e.f. 25.1.1990, till 1996, he had taken steps for his reengagement, I am of the opinion that he should be ordered to be reengagement from the year, 1996 i.e. w.e.f. 1.1.1996. Accordingly, I order so. As far as grant of back wages to the petitioner are concerned, I may mention that *the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 2010 (1) SLJ S.C 70, M/s Ritu Marbals Vs. Prabhakant Shukla* has ruled that "full back wages cannot be granted mechanically, upon a order of termination be declared illegal. It is further held that reinstatement must not be accompanied by payment of full back wages even for the period when the workman remained out of service and contributed little or nothing to the Industry".

15. Consequently, for what has been stated and observed above, the petitioner is held entitled to be reinstated in service with seniority and continuity but without back wages w.e.f. 1.1.1996. Thus, my answer to this issue is in "Yes".

*Relief.*

As a sequel to my discussion/findings on the aforesaid issues, the claim of the petitioner is partly allowed and as such the respondents are directed to reinstate him with seniority and continuity but without back wages w.e.f. 1.1.1996. Let a copy of this award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in official gazette. File, after completion be consigned to records.

Announced in the open court today this day of 11th March, 2015.

(A.S JASWAL),  
Presiding Judge,  
Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Shimla.

---

Ref.13/2014

**Rakesh Kumar V/s Dagshai Public School, Solan**

18/3/2015

Present:- Sh. Niranjana Verma Adv. for the petitioner.  
Sh. V.K.Gupta AR for the respondent.

It has been stated by Shri Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner that already a compromise has been effected between the parties. He further stated that consequent upon the compromise, so effected between the parties, the petitioner does not want to proceed with his claim, arising out of the reference which has been made to this court by the appropriate government,

Since I am satisfied that a lawful compromise has already been effected between parties, I proceed to record the statement of Sh. Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri V.K.Gupta, AR for the respondent has also admitted the compromise to be correct and acceptable in terms of the statement made by Shri Niranjana verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

The reference, which has been made to his Court, is as under:—

**“Whether termination of the services of Shri Rakesh Kumar S/o Shri Hari Nand R/o Village Anhech, P.O dagshai, Tehsil & District Solan, HP w.e.f. 18.8.2012 who was employed as Mali-cum Chowkidar by the Employer/Director, Dagshai Public School Cantt, District Solan, HP without complying with the provisions of the industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified ?If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employer?”**

Since, in terms of statement of Shri Niranjana verma, Advocate for the petitioner, a compromise/ Settlement has already been effected between the parties, which has also been admitted to be correct and acceptable by Shri V.K.Gupta, AR for the respondent, this reference which has been made to this Court stands disposed of to have been compromise. The statement of Shri Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner shall form part and parcel of this order/ awards. Let a copy of this order/award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to records.

Announced

10.03.2015

Sd/-

*Presiding Judge,  
Labour court, Shimla.*

---

**Ref.14/2014**

**Smt Manju Bala V/s Dagshai Public School, Solan**

18/3/2015

*Present:-* Sh. Niranjana Verma Adv. for the petitioner.  
Sh. V.K.Gupta AR for the respondent.

It has been stated by Shri Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner that already a compromise has been effected between the parties. He further stated that consequent upon the

compromise, so effected between the parties, the petitioner does not want to proceed with his claim, arising out of the reference which has been made to this court by the appropriate government,

Since I am satisfied that a lawful compromise has already been effected between parties, I proceed to record the statement of Sh. Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri V.K.Gupta, AR for the respondent has also admitted the compromise to be correct and acceptable in terms of the statement made by Shri Niranjana verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

The reference, which has been made to his Court, is as under:-

**“Whether termination of the services of Shri Smt Manju Bala W/o Sh Rakesh Kumar R/o Village Anhech, P.O dagshai, Tehsil & District Solan, HP w.e.f. 18.8.2012 who was employed as Peon by the Employer/Director, Dagshai Public School Cantt, District Solan, HP without complying with the provisions of the industrial Disputes Act, 1947, is legal and justified ?If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above worker is entitled to from the above employer?”**

Since, in terms of statement of Shri Niranjana verma, Advocate for the petitioner, a compromise/ Settlement has already been effected between the parties, which has also been admitted to be correct and acceptable by Shri V.K.Gupta, AR for the respondent, this reference which has been made to this Court stands disposed of to have been compromise. The statement of Shri Niranjana Verma, Advocate for the petitioner shall form part and parcel of this order/ awards. Let a copy of this order/award be sent to the appropriate government for publication in the official gazette. File, after completion, be consigned to records.

Announced  
10.03.2015

*Presiding Judge,  
Labour court, Shimla*

## LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-171001, the 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2015*

**No. 11-23/84(Lab) ID/2012-Mandi.**—Whereas Smt. Babli Devi W/O Shri Sohan Lal, R/O Village Bahri, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. had raised a demand notice dated 01.06.2010 regarding her illegal termination from the services by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. The Labour Officer-cum Conciliation Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. tried to settle the industrial dispute amicably, but the same could not be settled during the course of conciliation proceedings, where after he sent a report under Section 12(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to the undersigned;

And whereas the report sent by the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. was considered and examined and undersigned came to the conclusion that

above worker had raised the dispute at a belated stage of more than 10 years and therefore declined the reference of the dispute vide order dated- 22nd March, 2012;

And whereas Smt. Babli Devi W/O Shri Sohan Lal agitated the above orders of declining of reference of her industrial dispute to the Ld. Labour Court before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh vide C.W.P. No. 2261/2014. The Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh has disposed of the C.W.P. on 18.10.2014 and directed the undersigned to refer the dispute of the above workman to the Ld. Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal. The operative part of the said judgment is reproduced as follows:

- "4. The question of delay and laches can be seen at the time of moulding the relief by the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal.*
- 5. Accordingly, in view of above discussion and analysis the present petition is allowed. Annexures P-11 to P-20 dated 19.03.2013, 30.03.2012, 17.03.2012, 30.03.2012, 31.03.2012, 15.02.2013, 22.03.2012, 19.03.2013, 16.03.2012 and 16.03.2012, respectively, are quashed and set aside. Respondent No.-2 is directed make reference to the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal within a period of four weeks from today. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No costs."*

Therefore, in view of above the undersigned while exercising the powers vested by the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh vide Notification No.: Shram(A) 4-9/2006-IV-Loose, Dated 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 and as per power vested under Sub Section-1 of Section 10 of The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) this industrial dispute is referred to the Labour Court/Industrial Tribunal Dharamsala, constituted under Section-7 of Act *ibid*, on the following issue/issues for legal adjudication:

*"Whether the industrial dispute raised by the worker Smt. Babli Devi W/O Shri Sohan Lal, R/O Village Bahri, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. before the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. vide demand notice dated 01.06.2010 regarding her alleged illegal termination of service w.e.f. 01.11.1999 suffers from delay and laches? If not, Whether termination of the services of Smt. Babli Devi W/O Shri Sohan Lal, R/O Village Bahri, P.O. Kot, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. w.e.f. 01.11.1999 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged by the worker, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above employer?"*

By order,  
Sd/-  
*Deputy Labour Commissioner.*

## LABOUR & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT

### NOTIFICATION

*Shimla-171001, the 20<sup>th</sup> January, 2015*

**No. 11-23/84(Lab) ID/2013-Mandi.**—Whereas Smt. Bachani Devi W/O Shri Kalu Ram, R/O Village Dev Bradta, P.O. Chowk, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. had raised a demand notice dated 23.02.2011 regarding her illegal termination from the services by the Executive

Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. The Labour Officer-cum Conciliation Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. tried to settle the industrial dispute amicably, but the same could not be settled during the course of conciliation proceedings, where after he sent a report under Section 12(4) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to the undersigned;/

And whereas the report sent by the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Mandi, District Mandi, H.P. was considered and examined and undersigned came to the conclusion that above worker had raised the dispute at a belated stage of more than 9 years and therefore declined the reference of the dispute vide order dated 19th March, 2013;

And whereas Smt. Bachani Devi W/O Shri Kalu Ram agitated the above orders of declining of reference of her industrial dispute to the Ld. Labour Court before the Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh vide C.W.P. No. 2261/2014. The Hon'ble High Court of Himachal Pradesh has disposed of the C.W.P. on 18.10.2014 and directed the undersigned to refer the dispute of the above workman to the Ld. Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal. The operative part of the said judgment is reproduced as follows;

4. *The question of delay and laches can be seen at the time of moulding the relief by the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal.*
5. *Accordingly, in view of above discussion and analysis the present petition is allowed. Annexures P-11 to P-20 dated 19.03.2013, 30.03.2012, 17.03.2012, 30.03.2012, 31.03.2012, 15.02.2013, 22.03.2012, 19.03.2013, 16.03.2012 and 16.03.2012, respectively, are quashed and set aside. Respondent No.-2 is directed make reference to the Labour Court-cum-Industrial Tribunal within a period of four weeks from today. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of. No costs."*

Therefore, in view of above the undersigned while exercising the powers vested by the Govt. of Himachal Pradesh vide Notification No.: Shram(A) 4-9/2006-IV-Loose, Dated 15<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 and as per power vested under Sub Section-1 of Section 10 of The Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) this industrial dispute is referred to the Labour Court/Industrial Tribunal Dharamsala, constituted under Section-7 of Act *ibid*, on the following issue/issues for legal adjudication.

“Whether the industrial dispute raised by the worker Smt. Bachani Devi W/O Shri Kalu Ram, R/O Village Dev Bradta, P.O. Chowk, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. before the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. vide demand notice dated 23.02.2011 regarding her alleged illegal termination of service w.e.f. 01.11.1999 suffers from delay and latches? If not, Whether termination of the services of Smt. Bachani Devi W/O Shri Kalu Ram, R/O Village Dev Bradta, P.O. Chowk, Tehsil Sarkaghat, District Mandi, H.P. by the Executive Engineer, H.P.P.W.D. (B&R) Division, Dharampur, District Mandi, H.P. w.e.f. 01.11.1999 without complying the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, as alleged by the worker, is legal and justified? If not, what amount of back wages, seniority, past service benefits and compensation the above aggrieved workman is entitled to from the above employer?”

By order,  
Sd/-  
Deputy Labour Commissioner.

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

तारीख पेशी : 12-6-2015

श्रीमती सिमरो देवी पुत्री श्री गुलाबू, निवासी वण्डिया, तहसील बैजनाथ

... आवेदक

बनाम

आम जनता वण्डिया

... प्रतिवादी

प्रार्थना पत्र वराये दरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में प्यूगला देवी के बजाए रोशनी देवी दर्ज करने बारे।

इश्तहार:

उपरोक्त आवेदक श्रीमती सिमरो देवी पुत्री श्री गुलाबू, वासी वण्डिया, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने अदालत हजा में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि वह महाल वण्डिया में भू स्वामी है। राजस्व रिकॉर्ड में उसका नाम प्यूगला देवी दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। अतः उसने रोशनी देवी दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 12-6-2015 को अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थना पत्र पर नियमानुसार उचित आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

तारीख पेशी : 12-6-2015

श्री रविन्दर चन्द पुत्र श्री मस्त राम, निवासी वरकडी, डा0 कैलासपुर, तहसील पालमपुर ... आवेदक।

बनाम

आम जनता

... प्रतिवादी

प्रार्थना पत्र वराये दरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में रजिन्दर कुमार के बजाए रविन्दर चन्द दर्ज करने बारे।

इश्तहार:

उपरोक्त आवेदक श्री रविन्दर चन्द पुत्र श्री मस्त राम, वासी वरकडी, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने अदालत हजा में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि वह महाल टिकरी में भू स्वामी है। राजस्व रिकॉर्ड में उसका नाम रजिन्दर कुमार दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। अतः उसने रविन्दर चन्द दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 12-6-2015 को अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थना पत्र पर नियमानुसार उचित आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

तारीख पेशी : 12-6-2015

श्री केसर सिंह पुत्र श्री रसीला राम, निवासी वूहली ठेहड, तहसील बैजनाथ आवेदक

बनाम

आम जनता वूहली ठेहड प्रतिवादी

प्रार्थना पत्र वराये दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में मेरे पिता का नाम रगीला राम के बजाए रसीला राम दर्ज करने बारे।

इशतहार:

उपरोक्त आवेदक श्री केसर सिंह पुत्र श्री रसीला राम, वासी वूहली ठेहड, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने अदालत हजा में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि वह महाल वूहली ठेहड में भू स्वामी है। राजस्व रिकॉर्ड में उसके पिता का नाम रगीला राम दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। अतः उसने रसीला राम दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 12-6-2015 को अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थना पत्र पर नियमानुसार उचित आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा किया गया।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

तारीख पेशी : 12-6-2015

फ्रिमा देवी पुत्री श्री विधू, निवासी समलेतर, डाकघर कोठी, तहसील बैजनाथ आवेदक

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी

प्रार्थना पत्र वराये दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में प्रेमी देवी के बजाए फ्रिमा देवी दर्ज करने बारे।

उपरोक्त आवेदक फ्रिमा देवी पुत्री श्री विधू, वासी समलेतर, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र० ने अदालत हजा में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि वह महाल समलेतर में भू स्वामी है। राजस्व रिकॉर्ड में उसका नाम प्रेमी देवी दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। अतः उसने फ्रिमा देवी दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 12-6-2015 को अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थना पत्र पर नियमानुसार उचित आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 23-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा किया गया।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०

श्री प्रदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री चिन्त राम, निवासी छेक, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना-पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्री प्रदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री चिन्त राम, निवासी गांव छेक, डाकखाना चढ़ियार, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र० ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका अपना जन्म दिनांक 19-5-1980 को महाल छेक में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 12-6-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 23-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

श्रीमती दानो देवी पत्नी Hans Raj, r/o Karanarthu, Tehsil Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती दानो देवी पत्नी Hans Raj, निवासी गांव करनार्थू, डाकखाना घटाहर, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पति श्री हंस राज (Hans) की मृत्यु दिनांक 1-9-2004 को महाल करनार्थू में हुई थी परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 12-6-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त मृत्यु का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 25-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

Shri Sunil Kumar s/o Shri Piar Chand, r/o VPO Usteher (उस्तेहड), तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Shri Sunil Kumar s/o Shri Piar Chand, r/o VPO Usteher (उस्तेहड), डाकखाना Usteher, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Sidharth Bhangalia (भंगालीया) का जन्म दिनांक 28-9-2004 को महाल Usteher में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 12-6-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 25-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

तारीख पेशी : 12-6-2015

श्री अजीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी कुकैनां, तहसील बैजनाथ

आवेदक

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रतिवादी

प्रार्थना पत्र वराये दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख में जीत सिंह के बजाए अजीत सिंह दर्ज करने बारे।

उपरोक्त आवेदक अजीत सिंह पुत्र श्री मोती राम, निवासी कुकैनां, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने अदालत हजा में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि वह महाल कुकैनां में भू स्वामी है। राजस्व रिकॉर्ड में उसका नाम जीत सिंह दर्ज है जो कि गलत है। अतः उसने अजीत सिंह दर्ज करने का आग्रह किया है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इशतहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को इस बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 12-6-2015 को अदालत हजा में हाजिर होकर प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थना पत्र पर नियमानुसार उचित आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 25-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री लेख राम धीमान, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

श्रीमती रक्षा देवी पत्नी अशोक कुमार, r/o नरघोड़, डाकघार चोवू, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती रक्षा देवी पत्नी अशोक कुमार, निवासी नरघोड़, डाकघार चोवू, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र साहिल सिंह राणा का जन्म दिनांक

28-12-1992 को महाल नरघोड़ में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 12-6-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 25-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

लेख राम धीमान,  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

-----  
ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, r/o निवासी गांव Tashijong, डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Tenzin Yangdon का जन्म दिनांक 1-6-1984 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/-  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

-----  
ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Atop s/o Lhagyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Atop s/o Lhagyal, निवासी गांव TCC Tashijong डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी niece Tsering Wangmo d/o Dakpa का जन्म दिनांक 10-10-1981 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत श्री Lekh Ram Dhiman कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Atop s/o Lhagyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Atop s/o Lhagyal, निवासी गांव TCC Tashijong, डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके cousin Lekshek Tsering s/o Tsewang Dakpa का जन्म दिनांक 20-11-1974 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, निवासी गांव Tashijong, डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Sonam Chozom का जन्म दिनांक 1-7-1980 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक ..... को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Samjoo Dolma w/o Tsering Dorjee, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Samjoo Dolma w/o Tsering Dorjee, निवासी गांव Dege Division Bir, डाकखाना Bir, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Sonam Dolma का जन्म दिनांक 13-9-1976 को महाल Bir में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Samjoo Dolma w/o Tsering Dorjee, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Samjoo Dolma w/o Tsering Dorjee, निवासी गांव Dege Division Bir, डाकखाना Bir, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Karma Tshuttrim का जन्म दिनांक 15-3-1977 को महाल Bir में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असातन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, निवासी गांव Tashijong डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Tsering Tsomo का जन्म 1-10-1982 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 28-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असातन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि० प्र०

Sonam Palden s/o Sonam Dorjee, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Sonam Palden s/o Sonam Dorjee, निवासी गांव Dege Division Bir, डाकखाना Bir, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि० प्र० ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके Father Sonam Dorjee s/o Nyima की मृत्यु दिनांक 20-7-2004 को महाल Bir में हुई थी परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असातन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त मृत्यु का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि० प्र०

Chewang w/o Sonam Dorjee, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Chewang w/o Sonam Dorjee, निवासी गांव Dege Division Bir, डाकखाना Bir, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि० प्र० ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Sonam Palden का जन्म दिनांक 3-6-1973 को महाल Bir में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि० प्र०

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Sherap Sangpo s/o T. Rabgyal, निवासी गांव Tashijong डाकखाना Taragarh, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि० प्र० ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Sonam Choedon का जन्म दिनांक 10-10-1986 को महाल Tashijong में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक ..... को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित/—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि० प्र०।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Chewang w/o Sonam Dorjee, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Chewang w/o Sonam Dorjee, निवासी गांव Dege Division Bir, डाकखाना Bir, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसकी पुत्री Tenzin Cheyang का जन्म दिनांक 20-10-1978 को महाल Bir में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत Shri Lekh Ram Dhiman कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Tsering Yangchen, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Tsering Yangchen wd/o Tashi Dhargyal, निवासी गांव H. No. 104, Chauntra, डाकखाना Tibetan Colony, तहसील J. Nagar, जिला Mandi हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Sonam Dhondup का जन्म दिनांक 6<sup>th</sup> July, 1977 को महाल Bir में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 28-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Om Prakash s/o Shri Donku Ram, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Om Prakash s/o Shri Donku Ram, निवासी गांव Kotli, डाकखाना Gunehar, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Mahesh का जन्म दिनांक 11-8-2009 को महाल Kotli में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक ..... को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।  
मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा, हि0 प्र0

Laxman s/o Shri Donku Ram, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवम् मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969.

Laxman s/o Shri Donku Ram, निवासी गांव Kotli, डाकखाना Gunehar, तहसील Baijnath, जिला Kangra हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि उसके पुत्र Amit Kumar का जन्म दिनांक 14-9-2009 को महाल Kotli में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अब पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्व-साधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण के बारे में कोई उजर एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 29-5-2015 को सुबह 10.00 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म का पंजीकरण करने के आदेश दे दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक ..... को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।  
मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—  
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,  
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

ब अदालत जनाब सहायक समाहर्ता एवम् कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी, ज्वाली,  
जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0

श्री हस राज पुत्र श्री वृज लाल, निवासी महाल समकेहड़, मौजा गुगलाडा, तहसील ज्वाली, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम 1969.

श्री हस राज पुत्र श्री वृज लाल, गांव समकेहड़, मौजा गुगलाडा, तहसील ज्वाली, जिला कांगड़ा हि0 प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना पत्र गुजारा है कि श्रीमती विध्या देवी विधवा श्री वृज लाल की मृत्यु 28-8-1993 को गांव समकेहड़ में हुई थी, जो गलती से पंचायत रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकृत नहीं करवा सका। अब मृत्यु तिथि पंचायत रिकॉर्ड में दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त पंजीकरण बारे में कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 21-5-2015 को सुबह 10 बजे इस न्यायालय में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूरत में एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर मृत्यु तिथि पंचायत रिकॉर्ड में पंजीकृत करने के आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे। इसके उपरान्त कोई एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 29-4-2015 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित /—

सहायक समाहर्ता एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी प्रथम श्रेणी,  
ज्वाली, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0 प्र0)।

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kalpa at Reckong Peo,  
District Kinnaur (H.P.)**

Case No. 06/2015

Date of Institution : 25-4-2015

Shri Dalip Singh s/o Shri Vidya Pur, r/o Village Powari, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur,  
H.P. . . Applicant.

*Versus*

General Public

**Application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969.**

Notice for publication in the Rajpatra of Himachal Pradesh.

The above named applicant has presented an application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969 supported by an affidavit stating therein that his son named Aditya was born on 1-6-2013 but due to inadvertence, he could not get the birth registered in the records of Gram

Panchayat Powari. He has further requested to issue an order for registration of birth of the same in the records of Gram Panchayat Powari, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur.

Therefore, notice is hereby issued to the general public through this publication that if anybody has any objection for the registration of birth of said child in the records of Gram Panchayat Kothi, he/she may prefer his/her written or verbal objection before the undersigned within a period of one month *i.e.* before 25-5-2015 failing which it will be presumed that nobody has any objection for registration of birth of said child and order under the Act *ibid* will be issued to the Local Registrar of Gram Panchayat Kothi.

Issued under my hand and seal of the Court today on 25<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2015.

Seal.

Sd/-  
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,  
Kalpa at Reckong Peo.

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kalpa at Reckong Peo,  
District Kinnaur (H.P.)**

Case No. 07/2015

Date of Institution : 27-4-2015

Smt. Ishwar Devi w/o Late Shri Devinder Singh, r/o Village Kalpa, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur, H.P. . . Applicant.

*Versus*

General Public

**Application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969.**

Notice for publication in the Rajpatra of Himachal Pradesh.

The above named applicant has presented an application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969 supported by an affidavit stating therein that her son named Kulbhushan was born on 8-11-1989 but due to inadvertence, she could not get the birth registered in the records of Gram Panchayat Kalpa. She has further requested to issue an order for registration of birth of the same in the records of Gram Panchayat Kalpa, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur.

Therefore, notice is hereby issued to the general public through this publication that if anybody has any objection for the registration of birth of said Kulbhushan in the records of Gram Panchayat Kalpa, he/she may prefer his/her written or verbal objection before the undersigned within a period of one month *i.e.* before 25-5-2015 failing which it will be presumed that nobody has any objection for registration of birth of Kulbhushan and order under the Act *ibid* will be issued to the Local Registrar of Gram Panchayat Kothi.

Issued under my hand and seal of the Court today on 27<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2015.

Seal.

Sd/-  
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,  
Kalpa at Reckong Peo.

**In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kalpa at Reckong Peo,  
District Kinnaur (H.P.)**

Case No. 08/2015

Date of Institution : 27-4-2015

Shri Kehar Singh s/o Shri Charan Dev, r/o Village Telangi, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur, H.P. . . Applicant.

*Versus*

General Public

**Application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969.**

Notice for publication in the Rajpatra of Himachal Pradesh.

The above named applicant has presented an application U/S 13(3) of Births and Deaths Registration Act, 1969 supported by an affidavit stating therein that his sister named Miss Rameshwari was expired on 14-9-2013 but due to inadvertence, he could not get the death registered in the records of Gram Panchayat Telangi. He has further requested to issue an order for registration of death of the same in the records of Gram Panchayat Telangi, Tehsil Kalpa, District Kinnaur.

Therefore, notice is hereby issued to the general public through this publication that if anybody has any objection for the registration of death of said Rameshwari in the records of Gram Panchayat Telangi he/she may prefer his/her written or verbal objection before the undersigned within a period of one month *i.e.* before 25-5-2015 failing which it will be presumed that nobody has any objection for registration of death of said Miss Rameshwari and order under the Act *ibid* will be issued to the Local Registrar of Gram Panchayat Telangi.

Issued under my hand and seal of the Court today on 27<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2015.

Seal.

Sd/-

*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,  
Kalpa at Reckong Peo.*

लोक निर्माण विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला-2, 7 मई, 2015

**सं0पी0बी0डब्ल्यू0(बी0)एफ(5) 26/2014.**—यतः हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल को यह प्रतीत होता है कि हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार को सरकारी व्यय पर सार्वजनिक प्रयोजन हेतु नामत राज माता शान्ति देवी वरिष्ठ माध्यमिक पाठशाला से खेल परिसर सड़क के निर्माण हेतु भूमि अर्जित करनी अपेक्षित है, अतएव एतद् द्वारा यह अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त परिक्षेत्र में जैसा कि निम्न विवरणी में निर्दिष्ट किया गया है, उपरोक्त प्रयोजन के लिए भूमि का अर्जन अपेक्षित है।

2. यह अधिसूचना ऐसे सभी व्यक्तियों को, जो इससे सम्बन्धित हो सकते हैं, की जानकारी के लिए भूमि अर्जन, पुनर्वास और पुनर्व्यवस्थापन में उचित प्रतिकर और पारदर्शिता अधिकार अधिनियम, 2013 (2013 का 30) की धारा-11 के उपबन्धों के अन्तर्गत जारी की जाती है।

3. पूर्वोक्त धारा द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए राज्यपाल हिमाचल प्रदेश इस समय इस उपक्रम में कार्यरत सभी अधिकारियों उनके कर्मचारियों और श्रमिकों को इलाके की किसी भी भूमि में प्रवेश करने और सर्वेक्षण करने तथा उप धारा द्वारा अपेक्षित अथवा अनुमत: अन्य सभी कार्यों को करने के लिए सहर्ष प्राधिकार देते हैं।

4. कोई भी हितबद्ध व्यक्ति जिसे उक्त परिक्षेत्र में कथित भूमि के अर्जन पर कोई आपति हो तो वह इस अधिसूचना के प्रकाशित होने के तीस दिन की अवधि के भीतर लिखित रूप में भू-अर्जन समाहर्ता, लोक निर्माण विभाग, विन्ट फिल्ड शिमला, (हि0 प्र0) के समक्ष अपनी आपति दायर कर सकता है।

### विवरणी

जिला	तहसील	गांव	खसरा न0	रकवा (बीघा में)
कुल्लू	निरमण्ड	फाटी निरमण्ड	1242	0-17
			किता: 1	0-17

आदेश द्वारा,  
हस्ताक्षरित/—  
अति0 मुख्य सचिव (लोक निर्माण)।